position, said alarm being adapted to be attached to said wires for said oil pressure warning light and to sound under the same conditions as said oil pressure warning light is illuminated.

Claim 11. (original): The audible warning system of claim 10, wherein said alarm is selected from the group of alarm devices comprising sirens, bells, buzzers, horns, whistles, beepers, chimes, buzzers, and electronic voice synthesizers.

Claim 12. (new): The audible warning system of claim 10, further comprising a comparator adapted to supply current to said alarm only if said engine shutoff switch is in the off position.

Claim 13. (new): The audible warning system of claim 8, wherein said audible signal comprises a recorded message warning that said ignition switch has been left on.

Claim 14. (new): The audible warning system of claim 12, wherein said audible signal comprises a recorded message warning that said ignition switch has been left on.

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS:

Claims 1 - 11 are in this application. Claims 1-11 have been rejected. Claims 1 - 6 have been canceled. Claim 10 has been amended. New claims 12 - 14 have been added.

The examiner has rejected claims 1-5 and 7-11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tharman et al [US 6,975,216 B2]. The examiner rejected claim 6 under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tharman et al as applied to the claims above, and further in view of Umehara [US 6,016,006].

Applicants have canceled claims 1-6.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of claims 7 - 9. While Tharman includes many of the same components of the present invention, the components of Tharman are assembled to function in a different manner. While is would be possible to take some of the components of Tharman and assemble them according to the invention, such a combination would be contrary to the teachings of Tharman and would not be obvious. The examiner stated the following: "While not explicitly shown in the Tharman reference, when the panic switch is actuated and the engine is stopped, the oil pressure will invariably drop below a minimum oil pressure. Based on the drawings in Figure 3, whether OR logic or AND logic (as claimed in the present claim) is used, the end result would be the sounding of the alarm. In other words, the open or closed state of the oil pressure switch would not change the functionality of the system." The audible alarm of Tharman, as depicted in Figure 2, will create an audible alarm in one circumstance - after the engine is started, the fluid sensor S1 indicates a problem, such as low oil pressure. The audible alarm circuit of Tharman, as depicted in Figure 3, will create an audible alarm in only 2 circumstances: 1) the same condition as in Figure 2, indicating trouble with the engine; and 2) when the panic switch (corresponding to the engine shutoff switch of the invention) is engaged to stop the engine, indicating the operator is in trouble.

In contrast, the invention, as claimed in claim 7, provides an audible warning system adapted to sound only in the event the oil pressure switch is closed with the ignition switch in the on position and the shut off switch in the off position. The alarm circuit of Tharman et al can not perform this function. The circuit shown in Tharman et al Figure 2 does not include an engine shutoff switch. The circuit shown in Tharman et al Figure 3 sounds an audible alarm immediately upon closing the engine shutoff switch regardless of whether the fluid sensor S1 is open or closed. Tharman et al does not teach or suggest an audible alarm circuit adapted to sound an audible alarm only in the event the engine shutoff switch is engaged and the oil pressure switch is closed with the ignition switch in the on position. To the contrary, the intent of Tharman et al is to sound the audible alarm immediately upon engaging the "panic switch" - introducing the fluid sensor S1 into the circuit would destroy the functionality of the Tharman et al audible alarm.

Claims 8 and 9 depend from claim 7, contain all limitations thereof, and are patentable therewith.

Claim 10 has been amended to more clearly state and particularly point out that the audible alarm will sound under the same conditions as the oil pressure warning light is illuminated. Support for this amendment can be found in the specification in Paragraph (0018), lines 2 - 4. The warning system according to claim 10, as amended, provides an audible alarm system adapted to be retrofitted to a motorcycle to sound an audible alarm in the event the oil pressure is low with the ignition switch in the on position. Tharman et al contemplates the sounding of an audible alarm for low oil pressure only when the engine is running to warn of a failure of the lubricating system. The sounding of the alarm during starting of the engine is suppressed. Also, once the engine stops, the enable switch, Q1, will be turned OFF and the audible alarm will not sound even though the oil pressure switch is activated. Therefore, while Tharman et al appears to function similarly to the claimed invention, in fact it does not produce an audible alarm when the ignition switch is turned on with the oil pressure switch activated under the same conditions as the oil pressure light is illuminated but only when the engine is running.

Claim 11 depends from claim 10, contains all the limitations thereof, and is patentable therewith.

New claim 12 has been added to claim an embodiment of the invention in which the audible alarm of claim 10 is sounded only if the engine shutoff switch is in the off position. Support for this amendment can be found with reference to the specification at Paragraph (0020) and with reference to Figure 4. The audible alarm of new claim 12 will sound only if the ignition switch is in the on position, the oil pressure switch is closed and the engine shutoff switch is in the off position. In this embodiment, the audible alarm warns only that the ignition switch has been left on with the motorcycle not running. As described above, Tharman et al to not teach or suggest that such an alarm is desirable.

New claim 13 has been added to claim the embodiment of the invention set forth in the specification at Paragraph (0019) lines 4 - 17. New claim 13 depends from claim 8, contains all the limitations thereof and is patentable therewith.

New claim 14 has been added to claim the embodiment of the invention set forth in the specification at Paragraph (0019) lines 4 - 17. New claim 14 depends from claim 12, contains all the limitations thereof and is patentable therewith.

In conclusion, Applicants believe that the Tharman et al reference, while containing many of the same components of the present invention, does not teach or suggest the invention as presently claimed and, in fact, teaches away from the combination of the invention as presently claimed. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims of the invention, as presently amended, are not obvious in view of the cited references.

For the above reasons, Applicants believe the pending claims are allowable. Early and favorable action is earnestly solicited for claims 7-14.

Date: June 21, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

Donald M. Satina

Donald M. Satina
Reg. No. 31,875
Attorney for Applicant

Donald M. Satina, Esq.
902 Broadway
McKees Rocks, PA 15135
Tel: (412) 429-1800 (6937)
Fax: (412) 276-7252